

## **REMARKS**

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant hereby confirms Applicant's election to pursue the claims set forth in Group I, i.e. claims 1-11 and 18 drawn to printing and verifying authentication documents. Accordingly, the claims set forth in Groups II and III have been cancelled from the instant application.

With regard to the specification referencing the co-pending application at lines 13-14 on page 11, application serial number and filing date have been provided.

The Examiner has objected to claims 9-11 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in paragraph 8. First with regard to claim 9, this claim has been cancelled and therefore the rejection with respect to this claim is no longer applicable.

In response to the objection to claim 10, claim 10 has been amended to clarify that there is a scanning of the document so as to obtain a scanned digital file so as to obtain said physical indicia identifier, the digital text file of the document and said dispersed message. The second last paragraph has been amended to recite distilling said digital text file, and on the second last line "recorded" has been amended to read recovered. It is believed that claim 10, as amended, overcomes the objection set forth and identified by the Examiner.

In view of the cancellation of certain claims of the present application, the objections set forth in paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 12 are no longer applicable. The only remaining rejection as set forth in paragraph 13 wherein the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-6 and 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawandy et al. in view of Tel and Zhao et al. for the reasons set forth therein.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither of the references cited either individually or in combination teach or suggest the invention as set forth by Applicants. Independent claims 1 and 10 are directed to a method for making an authenticateable document and a method for verifying that a document on a sheet of media is an original. Both claims require the step of combining the message image with the high resolution scan file of the physical indicia identifier so as to create a dispersed message. In the present invention, the text file is combined

with the scan file of the indicia identifier. This combination is not taught or suggested by any of the references. The Lawandy et al. reference is directed to a method and apparatus for identifying an object wherein a physical attribute of the document is utilized for encoding information on the document. For example, placement of a barcode having information relating directly to some physical aspect of the supporting document. See paragraph 56. There is no teaching or suggestion in this reference of creating a digital text file to be printed on the sheet and creating a digital text file, creating a message image using the distilled text file, and combining the message image with the high resolution scan file of the physical indicia identifier so as to create a dispersed message. What is taught in the Lawandy et al. reference is simply using a physical feature of the document and using that to create a digital watermark.

With regard to the present invention, Applicant refers the Examiner to page 13, lines 23 to page 14, line 21 of the specification, and figure 9B wherein it is discussed the steps for validating the document. As set forth therein, scanning of the document results in obtaining a digital text file which is then used to produce the distilled digital text file which then forms the candidate message image. The same scanned information is also used to locate the physical indicia identifier and obtain the dispersed message therein and correlating the indicia identifier with the physical indicia identifier with the dispersed message to obtain a recovered message. The recovered message and the candidate message image are compared to determine validity. In the present application there is a combining of the information regarding text that is to be printed on the document with the physical identifier information that is later broken down to obtain the desired information from the combined text and identifier. There is no such teaching or suggestion of providing the invention as taught and claimed by Applicant.

With regard to the Tel reference, this reference does not teach anything any more than what is disclosed in the Lawandy et al. reference. In the Tel reference, fibers present in the document are used to authenticate the document. There is no teaching or suggestion of taking a text file, distilling the digital text file and creating a message image using the distilled text file and combining the message image with the high resolution scan file of the physical indicia identifier so as to create a dispersed message. Likewise, the Zhao et al.

reference also fails to teach the invention as set forth by Applicants. Here again the Zhao et al. reference uses information that is embedded in the digital representation, as a watermark or as a barcode, for verification. There is no teaching or suggestion of combining the message image with the high resolution scan of the physical indicia as taught and claimed by Applicant nor do they teach or suggest the verification process as set forth in independent claim which requires the extraction of various information and the appropriate comparison as set forth.

With regard to independent claim 5, requires a correlating of the physical indicia identified with the dispersed message so as to obtain the first common data, and distilling the digital text file in accordance with a predetermined program so as to obtain a second common data. Here again there is a requiring of the scanning of the document so as to obtain the digital file of the physical indicia identifier, a digital file of said text, and said dispersed message, thus requiring obtaining validating information from the identifier and the combined text image. Thus, this claim is patentably distinct for the same reasons previously discussed.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/phw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-588-2728  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.